

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 18 have been amended by adding new limitations to further define the claimed invention. Support for the amendments to the claims is presented, for example, in the specification at page 11, lines 20-21 and page 15, lines 7-10 and 21-25. Thus, no new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments and reconsideration of the present application in view of the amendments and following remarks.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-14 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Tachibana (US 2005/0029277). As amended herein, Claim 1 recites, among other things, “a value of **pressure resistance of the liquid syringe**.”, “...**detector** for detecting a **pressure applied to the piston** member...” and “operation control means...controlling...such that the **detected pressure does not exceed the value of pressure resistance**.” The claimed chemical liquid injection system incorporating these features are submitted to be patentable under § 102 as discussed below.

Tachibana teaches a drug infusion device prompts warning when the **time and flow rates** are set beyond the upper and lower limits, which are recorded on identification tag attached on container or syringe. (Paragraph [0007]) and is silent about a **pressure applied to the piston**. Let alone the pressure, the cited reference does not teach any detecting means to monitor parameter during operation and operation control means for controlling it. Instead, the device of Tachibana merely compares the set data and stored data in the identification tag. Accordingly, the cited reference does not describe “pressure resistance of the liquid syringe”, detector for detecting a pressure applied to the piston” and “control means for controlling...such that the detected pressure does not exceed the value of pressure resistance.”

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submits that Claim 1 is novel over the cited reference. The rest of the rejected claims depend from base Claim 1, and further define additional technical features of the present invention. In view of the patentability of their base claim, and in further view of the additional technical features, Applicants respectfully submit that the dependent claims are patentable over cited reference.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 15 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Tachibana (US 2005/0029277) in view of Wilson et al. (US Patent No. 5573515). Claim 15 depends from Claim 1 and Claim 17 depends from Claim 15, and Claim 1 recites, among other things, “a value of pressure resistance of the liquid syringe **recorded thereon**”, while the cited references teach a user enters into an injection system parameters. Accordingly, none of Tachibana or Wilson, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests all of the features of Claim 1. Therefore, Claims 15 and 17 should not be rejected on this ground.

Further, Claim 15 recites, among other things, “the liquid warmer comprises: an **RFID reader** for obtaining the various types of data recorded on said RFID chip; and operation control means for performing a predetermined operation in accordance with at least some of the various types of obtained data” while Wilson teaches a simple ON/OFF operation.

Accordingly, none of Tachibana or Wilson, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests all of the features of Claim 15. Meanwhile, there is no additional prior art cited to remedy the deficiencies of the cited references. Further, there is no explanation as to why the differences between the cited references and the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established with respect to Claim 15, and thus Claim 15 is allowable over the cited references. Claim 17 depends from Claim 15, and further defines additional technical features of the present invention. In view of the patentability of Claim 15, and in further view of the additional technical features, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 17 is patentable over cited references.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 18-31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Tachibana (US 2005/0029277) in view of Hickie et al. (US 2003/0074233). As amended herein, Claim 18 recites, among other things, “a value of **pressure resistance of the liquid syringe.**”, “...**detector** for detecting **a pressure applied to the piston member...**” and “operation control means...controlling...such that the **detected pressure does not exceed the value of pressure**”

**resistance.”** The claimed chemical liquid injection system incorporating these features are submitted to be patentable under § 103 as discussed below.

Hickle does not described “pressure resistance of the liquid syringe”, “detector for detecting a pressure applied to the piston” and “control means for controlling...such that the detected pressure does not exceed the value of pressure resistance”

Accordingly, none of Tachibana or Hickle, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests all of the features of Claim 1. Meanwhile, there is no additional prior art cited to remedy the deficiencies of the cited references. Further, there is no explanation as to why the differences between the cited references and the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established with respect to Claim 18. The rest of the rejected claims depend from base Claim 18, and further define additional technical features of the present invention. In view of the patentability of their base claim, and in further view of the additional technical features, Applicants respectfully submit that the dependent claims are patentable over cited reference.

#### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 32 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Tachibana (US 2005/0029277) in view of Hickle et al. (US 2003/0074233) and further in view of Wilson et al. (US Patent No. 5573515) Claim 32 recites, among other things, “the liquid warmer comprises...an RFID reader for obtaining the various types of data recorded on said RFID chip; and operation control means for performing a predetermined operation in accordance with at least some of the various types of obtained data” while Wilson teaches a simple ON/OFF operation.

Accordingly, none of Tachibana, Hickle or Wilson, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests all of the features of Claim 32. Meanwhile, there is no additional prior art cited to remedy the deficiencies of the cited references. Further, there is no explanation as to why the differences between the cited references and the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that no *prima facie*

**Application No.:** 10/598,536  
**Filing Date:** September 1, 2006

case of obviousness has been established with respect to Claim 32, and thus Claims 32 is allowable over the cited references.

### **CONCLUSION**

In the light of the applicant's amendments to the claims and the foregoing Remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any remaining concerns which might prevent the prompt allowance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number appearing below.

### **No Disclaimers or Disavowals**

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope or referenced art, Applicant is not conceding in this application that previously pending claims are not patentable over the cited references. Rather, any alterations or characterizations are being made to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue at a later date any previously pending or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that Applicant has made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

**Application No.:** 10/598,536  
**Filing Date:** September 1, 2006

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: May 26, 2009

By:



Daniel E. Altman  
Registration No. 34,115  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20995  
(949) 760-0404

7123607  
051509